

FILED

AUG 09 2019

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Kenneth Wayne Lewis,

Plaintiff,

v.

William P. Barr *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 19-2013 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on its initial review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint, captioned "Responsive Pleading," and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court will grant the *in forma pauperis* application and dismiss the case because the complaint fails to meet the minimal pleading requirements of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Pro se litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Jarrell v. Tisch*, 656 F. Supp. 237, 239 (D.D.C. 1987). Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires complaints to contain "(1) a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction [and] (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a); *see Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009); *Ciralsky v. CIA*, 355 F.3d 661, 668-71 (D.C. Cir. 2004). The Rule 8 standard ensures that defendants receive fair notice of the claim being asserted so that they can prepare a responsive answer and an adequate defense and determine whether the doctrine of *res judicata* applies. *Brown v. Califano*, 75 F.R.D. 497, 498 (D.D.C. 1977).

A complaint “that contains only vague and conclusory claims with no specific facts supporting the allegations” simply fails to satisfy the pleading requirements of Rule 8(a). *Hilska v. Jones*, 217 F.R.D. 16, 21 (D.D.C. 2003) (citing *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 514 (2002)). Additionally, “a complaint that is . . . rambling, disjointed, incoherent, or full of irrelevant and confusing material will patently fail [Rule 8(a)’s] standard, and so will a complaint that contains an untidy assortment of claims that are neither plainly nor concisely stated, nor meaningfully distinguished from bold conclusions, sharp harangues and personal comments.” *Jiggetts v. D.C.*, 319 F.R.D. 408, 413 (D.D.C. 2017), *aff’d sub nom. Cooper v. D.C.*, No. 17-7021, 2017 WL 5664737 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 1, 2017) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted)). The instant complaint suffers from such defects.

Plaintiff is a federal prisoner at the Federal Correctional Institution in Fort Dix, New Jersey. The document liberally construed as a complaint refers to the Privacy Act, Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and “movant” and “nonmovants.” What is missing is a coherent set of facts and a clear statement showing plaintiff’s entitlement to relief. Therefore, this case will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: August 8, 2019


United States District Judge